

1 Kenneth S. Marks
2 Jonathan J. Ross
3 SUSMAN GODFREY LLP
4 1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100
5 Houston, Texas 77002-5096
6 Telephone: (713) 651-9366
7 Facsimile: (713) 654-6666
8 kmarks@susmangodfrey.com
9 jross@susmangodfrey.com
10 *Attorneys for plaintiff Alfred H. Siegel, solely
in his capacity as Trustee of the Circuit City
Stores, Inc. Liquidating Trust*
11 [additional counsel listed on signature page]

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. 07-5944 SC

MDL No. 1917

This Document Relates to:

All Indirect Purchaser Actions;

*Best Buy Co., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No.
11-cv-05513;*

*Best Buy Co., et al. v. Technicolor SA, et al.,
No. 13-cv-05264;*

*Sears, Roebuck and Co. and Kmart Corp. v.
Technicolor SA, No. 13-cv-05262;*

*Sears, Roebuck and Co. and Kmart Corp. v.
Chunghwa Picture tubes, Ltd., No. 11-cv-
05514;*

*Sharp Electronics Corp. v. Hitachi, Ltd., No.
13-cv-01173;*

*Sharp Electronics Corp. v. Koninklijke
Philips Electronics, N.V., et al., No. 13-cv-
02776;*

*Siegel v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 11-cv-
05502;*

*Siegel v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-
05261;*

**DIRECT ACTION PLAINTIFFS'
RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN LIMINE
NO. 12 [D.E. 3568]**

Judge: The Honorable Samuel Conti
Court: Courtroom No. 1, 17th Floor
Date: None Set

1 *Target Corp. v. Chunghwa Picture Tubes,*
 2 *Ltd., et al., No. 13-cv-05514;*
 3 *Target Corp. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No.*
 4 *13-cv-05686;*
 5 *Viewsonic Corp. v. Chunghwa Picture Tubes,*
 6 *Ltd., No. 14-cv-02510.*

7 In this case alleging the illegal price-fixing of CRTs, the jury should be presented with
 8 evidence of how defendants set the prices for the various CRTs they manufactured. But
 9 Defendants seek to exclude evidence and argument relevant to that issue, and on a matter of
 10 common sense: manufacturers will price different sizes of the same product in relationship to
 11 each other. Citing no authority that is in any way relevant to that simple proposition, defendants
 12 seek to deprive the jury of their own witnesses' testimony and contemporaneous documents that
 13 speak to this simple truth. Because the jury is entitled to consider this evidence, as well as expert
 14 testimony and argument regarding this evidence, defendants' motion must be denied.

15
 16 **I. The Evidence Demonstrates that Price Agreements on One Size CRT Had Effects on**
 17 **the Pricing of Other Size CRTs**

18 As defendants point out in their motion, their own witnesses have testified that in agreeing
 19 to supra-competitive pricing on one model of CRT, the conspirators necessarily had to set their
 20 prices on other sizes accordingly. [REDACTED] made this explicitly clear in his
 21 testimony:

22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

1
2
3
4 [REDACTED] attached to Declaration of
5 Jonathan J. Ross ("Ross Dec.") as Ex. A.
6

7 Defendants' contemporaneous documents also demonstrate this correlation between the
8 pricing of different size tubes. *See, e.g.*, Exs. 1229 & 1142 [REDACTED]
9

10 [REDACTED] attached to Ross Dec. as Exs. B & C. [REDACTED]
11

12 [REDACTED] comports with the common sense notion that
13 prices for different size products move in tandem, in either direction. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 2019 [REDACTED]
14

15 [REDACTED]
16 [REDACTED]
17 [REDACTED] attached to Ross Dec. as Ex. D. The evidence shows that the cartel's
18 goals were generalized: to use price collaboration to prevent prices from dropping for the full
19 range of CRTs, including large sized CRTs. *See, e.g.*, SDCRT-0002520 [REDACTED]
20

21 [REDACTED] attached to Ross
22 Dec. as Ex. E.
23

24 The cartel's reliance on price differentials for sizes is similar to its reliance on geographic
25 price differentials, which is also demonstrated by contemporaneous documents and defense
witness testimony. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 710, attached to Ross Dec. as Ex. F; Deposition Testimony of
26 [REDACTED]
27 [REDACTED] attached to Ross Dec. as Ex. A. Plaintiffs will
28 also present evidence that the cartel believed that [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] *See* CHU00029171 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] attached to Ross Dec. as Ex.

1 G. Defendants may, of course, attempt to counter this evidence, if they believe that evidence to
 2 the contrary exists in the record. What they may not do, of course, is prevent the jury from
 3 considering this evidence in the first place.
 4

5 **II. Defendants Present No Case Law Holding or Even Implying that Evidence of Price
 6 Correlation Is Inadmissible**

7 Defendants' motion lacks citation to even one case that supports their contention. Instead,
 8 defendants rely (in what they call a "related context") on cases which discuss the antitrust concept
 9 known as the "umbrella theory" of damages. Defendants' reliance is misplaced: these cases take
 10 issue with the contention that plaintiffs can recover damages for products sold by companies
 11 other than defendants on the theory that the defendants' price fixing raised prices throughout the
 12 industry. *See, e.g., In re Coordinated Proceedings in Petroleum Prods. Antitrust Litig.*, 691 F.2d
 13 1335 (9th Cir. 1982) (finding umbrella theory of damages inapplicable); *Mid-West Paper Prods.*
 14 *Co. v. Cont'l Grp., Inc.*, 596 F.2d 573 (3d Cir. 1979) (direct purchasers from competitors not
 15 entitled to sue on a theory that defendants' anticompetitive behavior made it possible for their
 16 competitors to charge higher prices); *Or. Laborers-Emp'rs Health & Welfare Trust Fund v. Philip*
 17 *Morris Inc.*, 185 F.3d 957 (9th Cir. 1999) (finding no direct link between tobacco companies'
 18 selling cigarettes and health plans paying for medical treatment of smokers). One of the cases
 19 cited actually upholds the plaintiff's causation theory. *See Theme Promotions, Inc. v. News Am.*
 20 *Mktg. FSI*, 546 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2008) (finding plaintiff's claimed antitrust injury to be a direct
 21 result of defendant's antitrust violation).

22 As the Ninth Circuit has explained, "the umbrella theory is essentially a consequential
 23 damages theory" which "seeks to hold price-fixers liable for harm allegedly flowing from the
 25 illegal conduct even though the price-fixing defendants received none of the illegal gains and
 26 were uninvolved in their competitors' pricing decisions." *In re Coordinated Proceedings in*

1 *Petroleum Prods.*, 691 F.2d at 1339. Here, by contrast, Plaintiffs are not seeking damages for
 2 products sold by companies unaffiliated with defendants on an umbrella damages theory. Rather,
 3 the DAPs seek damages for overcharges they paid on price-fixed CRTs or CRT Finished Products
 4 sold to them by defendants and their affiliated companies. The umbrella damages theory is
 5 simply irrelevant to the question of whether plaintiffs may present evidence of defendants' own
 6 pricing practices for CRTs purchased from defendants and their affiliates.

8 Defendants also cite to a few cases for the proposition that the plaintiffs have to show
 9 actual agreements to fix prices on the products at issue. However, none of those cases address
 10 (much less preclude) the type of evidence that defendants seek to exclude from the jury's
 11 consideration here: evidence that the cartel conducted its pricing using differentials and other
 12 means to ensure that all products were covered. *See, e.g., United States v. Socony-Vacuum Oil*
 13 *Co.*, 310 U.S. 150, 223-34 (1940) (holding that "the machinery employed by a combination for
 14 price-fixing is immaterial" such that any "combination formed for the purpose and with the effect
 15 of raising, depressing, fixing, pegging or stabilizing" price is "illegal *per se*"; *Palmer v. BRG of*
 16 *Ga. Inc.*, 498 U.S. 46, 48 (1990) (reaffirming *Socony-Vacuum* and emphasizing that antitrust
 17 conspiracy liability can be established "even though there was no direct agreement on . . . actual
 18 prices.") *Id.*

21 Defendants simply have no legal authority supporting their radical view that would usurp
 22 the jurors' role in considering the evidence and making their own determinations of what that
 23 evidence proves.

24 **III. Conclusion**

25 Defendants' motion in limine no. 12 should be denied.

1 Dated: February 27, 2015.
2
3

4 By: /s/ Kenneth S. Marks
5
6 Kenneth S. Marks
7 Jonathan J. Ross
8 Johnny W. Carter
9 Robert S. Safi
10 David M. Peterson
11 Brian M. Gillett
12 **SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.**
13 1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100
14 Houston, Texas 77002
15 Telephone: (713) 651-9366
16 Facsimile: (713) 654-6666
17 Email: kmarks@susmangodfrey.com
18 jross@susmangodfrey.com
jcarter@susmangodfrey.com
rsafi@susmangodfrey.com
dpeterson@susmangodfrey.com
bgillett@susmangodfrey.com

19 Parker C. Folse III
20 Rachel S. Black
21 Jordan Connors
22 **SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.**
23 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3800
24 Seattle, Washington 98101-3000
25 Telephone: (206) 516-3880
26 Facsimile: (206) 516-3883
27 Email: pfolse@susmangodfrey.com
rblack@susmangodfrey.com
jconnors@susmangodfrey.com

28 *Attorneys for plaintiff Alfred H. Siegel, solely in his
capacity as Trustee of the Circuit City Stores, Inc.
Liquidating Trust*

29 By: /s/ Craig A. Benson
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

1 Kenneth A. Gallo (*pro hac vice*)
2 Joseph J. Simons (*pro hac vice*)
3 Craig A. Benson (*pro hac vice*)
4 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP**
5 2001 K Street, NW
6 Washington, DC 20006
7 Telephone: (202) 223-7300
8 Facsimile: (202) 223-7420
9 Email: kgallo@paulweiss.com
10 Email: jsimons@paulweiss.com
11 Email: cbenson@paulweiss.com

12 Stephen E. Taylor (SBN 058452)
13 Jonathan A. Patchen (SBN 237346)
14 **TAYLOR & COMPANY LAW OFFICES, LLP**
15 One Ferry Building, Suite 355
16 San Francisco, California 94111
17 Telephone: (415) 788-8200
18 Facsimile: (415) 788-8208
19 Email: staylor@tcolaw.com
20 Email: jpatchen@tcolaw.com

21 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sharp Electronics Corporation and*
22 *Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Co. of America*

23 By: /s/ David Martinez

24 Roman M. Silberfeld
25 Bernice Conn
26 David Martinez
27 Laura Nelson
28 Jill Casselman
29 **ROBINS KAPLAN LLP**
30 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3400
31 Los Angeles, CA 90067-3208
32 Telephone: (310) 552-0130
33 Facsimile: (310) 229-5800

34 Email: rsilberfeld@robinskaplan.com
35 dmartinez@robinskaplan.com
36 bconn@robinskaplan.com
37 lnelson@robinskaplan.com
38 jcasselman@robinskaplan.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Attorneys For Plaintiffs Best Buy Co., Inc., Best Buy Purchasing LLC, Best Buy Enterprise Services, Inc., Best Buy Stores, L.P., and Bestbuy.com, L.L.C.

By: /s/ Jason Murray

Jason C. Murray (CA Bar No. 169806)
CROWELL & MORING LLP
515 South Flower St., 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: 213-443-5582
Facsimile: 213-622-2690
Email: jmurray@crowell.com

Jerome A. Murphy (pro hac vice)
Astor H.L. Heaven (pro hac vice)
CROWELL & MORING LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-624-2500
Facsimile: 202-628-5116
E-mail: jmurphy@crowell.com
Email aheaven@crowell.com

Attorneys for Target Corp. and Viewsonic Corp.

By: /s/ Richard Arnold

Richard Alan Arnold
William J. Blechman
Kevin J. Murray
KENNY NACHWALTER, P.A.
201 S. Biscayne Blvd., Suite 1100
Miami, FL 33131
Tel: 305-373-1000
Fax: 305-372-1861
Email: rarnold@knpa.com
Email: wblechman@knpa.com

1 Email: kmurray@knpa.com

2
3 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Sears, Roebuck and Co. and*
Kmart Corp.

4 By: /s/ Philip J. Iovieno

5
6 Stuart Singer
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
401 East Las Olas Blvd., Suite 1200
7 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
Telephone: (954) 356-0011
Facsimile: (954) 356-0022
8 Email: ssinger@bsflp.com

9
10 Philip J. Iovieno
11 Anne M. Nardacci
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
12 10 North Pearl Street, 4th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
Telephone: (518) 434-0600
Facsimile: (518) 434-0665
13 Email: piovieno@bsflp.com
Email: anardacci@bsflp.com

14
15 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Electrograph Systems, Inc.,*
Electrograph Technologies, Corp., Office Depot, Inc.,
Compucom Systems, Inc., Interbond Corporation of
America, P. C. Richard & Son Long Island Corporation,
Marta Cooperative of America, Inc., ABC Appliance, Inc.,
Schultze Agency Services LLC on behalf of Tweeter Opco,
LLC, Tweeter Newco, LLC, Tech Data Corporation, and
Tech Data Product Management, Inc.

16 By: /s/ David J. Burman

17 David J. Burman
Cori G. Moore
Nicholas H. Hesterberg
18 PERKINS COIE LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Telephone: (206) 359-8000
Facsimile: (206) 359-9000
Email: dburman@perkinscoie.com
Email: cgmoore@perkinscoie.com
Email: nhesterberg@perkinscoie.com

Jordan S. Bass (Cal. Bar No. 208143)
PERKINS COIE LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 2400
San Francisco, CA 94111-4131
Telephone: (415) 344.7000
Facsimile: (415) 344.7050
Email: jbass@perkinscoie.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Costco Wholesale Corporation